



# Run I/II $D\bar{O}$ Luminosity Constants

*Brendan Casey, 7/13/2004*

- Introduction
- Procedure
- Ingredients for Run I and Run II
- final corrections
- correlations



# Introduction

---

We call the effective inelastic cross-section the luminosity constant

$$\mathcal{L} = \frac{1}{\sigma_{eff}} \frac{dN}{dt}$$

$$\sigma_{eff} = \epsilon \times A \times \sigma_{inelastic}$$

$$\sigma_{inelastic} \equiv \sigma_{total} - \sigma_{elastic}$$

includes diffraction.

For Run II, we have new numbers for  $\sigma_{inelastic}$  and the fraction of diffractive events.

Run I luminosity constant needs to be updated to include these new numbers.

Dependence on  $\sigma_{inelastic}$  is trivial. Diffractive fraction plays a big part in determining  $A$ .



# Procedure



Inelastic and diffractive cross-sections are determined from other experiments.

Acceptance is determined using Monte Carlo.

Inelastic generators do not get the diffractive fraction correct.

⇒ determine the acceptance for each process separately and weight by the measured cross-sections

$$\sigma_{inelastic} = \sigma_{HC} + \sigma_{SD} + \sigma_{DD}$$

**HC**: non-diffractive, **SD**:  $p + \bar{p} \rightarrow p + X$ , **DD**:  $p + \bar{p} \rightarrow X$  w/o color flow (soft, forward)

$$A \times \sigma_{inelastic} = A_{SD} \sigma_{SD} + A_{DD} \sigma_{DD} + A_{HC} (\sigma_{inelastic} - \sigma_{SD} - \sigma_{DD})$$

$\epsilon$  determined in zero-bias data using independently tagged inelastic events with particles in our acceptance.



# Cross-Sections

---

	Run II	Run I old	Run I new
inelastic	$60.7 \pm 2.4$ mb	$57.55 \pm 1.56$ mb	$59.23 \pm 2.3$ mb
SD	$9.6 \pm 0.5$ mb	$9.57 \pm 0.43$ mb	$9.6 \pm 0.5$ mb
DD	$7.0 \pm 2.0$ mb	$1.29 \pm 0.20$ mb	$7.0 \pm 2.0$ mb

Run II inelastic is average of CDF and E811 measurements at 1.8 TeV and scaled to 1.96 TeV.

(*S. Klimenko, J. Konigsberg, T.M. Liss, FERMI LAB-FN-0741 (2003).*)

Scaling for diffractive is unknown, assumed to be small, not applied.

Run I DD was an estimate based on measured SD value, now DD measurements are available leading to the big change.



## Run II Acceptances

### Generator Level

	MBR	DTUJET	PHOJET	Pythia
HC	0.911	0.949	0.924	0.943
SD	0.183	0.088	0.280	0.242
DD	0.563	0.642	0.570	0.321

inelastic	0.75	0.78	0.78	0.76
-----------	------	------	------	------

Run I: used average of MBR and DTUJET, error =  $\pm$  half the difference

Run II: average of MBR and Pythia

$$\delta_{A_{HC}} = \pm \frac{1}{2} |\text{Pythia} - \text{MBR}| \quad \delta_{A_{SD}} = \delta_{A_{DD}} = \pm |\text{Pythia} - \text{MBR}|$$



# Acceptances

	Run II	Run I old	Run I new
HC	$0.982 \pm 0.0125$	$0.971 \pm 0.020$	$0.971 \pm 0.020$
SD	$0.313 \pm 0.137$	$0.151 \pm 0.050$	$0.151 \pm 0.050$
DD	$0.624 \pm 0.130$	$0.716 \pm 0.030$	$0.716 \pm 0.030$
inelastic	$0.833 \pm 0.028$	$0.829 \pm 0.018$	$0.807 \pm 0.017$

inelastic acceptance is the cross-section weighted acceptance with no cross-section error included.

Since we don't have the Run I MC available, its not feasible to update the Run I acceptance numbers.

Also wouldn't try to rescale the errors.



# Efficiencies

---

	Run II	Run Ia	Run Ib
inelastic	$0.909 \pm 0.018$	$0.95 \pm 0.02$	$0.907 \pm 0.02$

Thresholds changed between Run Ia and Run Ib



# Effective Cross-Sections

$$\sigma_{eff} = \epsilon \times [A_{SD}\sigma_{SD} + A_{DD}\sigma_{DD} + A_{HC}(\sigma_{inelastic} - \sigma_{SD} - \sigma_{DD})]$$

	old	new
Run II		$46 \pm 3$ mb
Run Ia	$45.32 \pm 2.02$ mb	$45.41 \pm 2.59$ mb
Run Ib	$43.27 \pm 1.95$ mb	$43.36 \pm 2.49$ mb

Only change is in  $\sigma_{inelastic}$ ,  $\sigma_{SD}$ , and  $\sigma_{DD}$ .

	central value	error
corrections for Run I cross-sections:		
Run Ia	0.998	1.280
Run Ib	0.998	1.275





# Run I, Run II, DØ, CDF Correlations

Inelastic and diffractive cross-sections 100% correlated for all

Acceptance: almost same generators for all, probably less than 100% correlated but closer to 100% than 0%  $\Rightarrow$  100%

Efficiencies: some correlations due to similar procedures but probably small  $\Rightarrow$  0%

Run II error: 6%(correlated)  $\oplus$  2.6%(uncorrelated)

Run Ia error: 5.3%(correlated)  $\oplus$  2.1%(uncorrelated)

Run Ib error: 5.3%(correlated)  $\oplus$  2.2%(uncorrelated)